REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending. Applicant notes with appreciation the indication of patentable subject matter recited in claims 7, 8, 11-14, 24-25 and 28-31, but respectfully request reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims.

The fundamental aspect of the present invention is the changing of a mode of reporting measured radio propagation parameters to the network controller, taking into account the speed of the mobile. In the response filed November 29, 2007, it was pointed out to the examiner that Heinonen teaches various measurements, but does not teach speed determination for purposes of changing a reporting mode, and Moreau teaches speed determination for purposes of predicting when a mobile will cross a cell boundary where handoff will be necessary, but Moreau also does not teach anything about changing a mode of reporting taking speed into account.

The examiner has now responded (at pages 9-10 of the Office action), but still appears to misunderstand Moreau and/or the present invention.

The present invention (as defined in claim 1) includes the steps of

- 1. Measuring parameters of radio propagation between the mobile and a fixed transceiver (i.e., base station);
- 2. Sending report messages to the radio network controller in accordance with a reporting mode specified by the RNC;
 - 3. The RNC determining an estimate of the speed of the mobile; and
- 4. The RNC processing the report messages and determining an appropriate mode of reporting, with the determined mode being dependent at least in part on the speed of the mobile.

Moreau receives reports and processes data, and the result of processing is to determine an appropriate handover (HO) time, or even an appropriate HO criterion. While Moreau does a lot with the received messages, including estimating speed and taking speed into account in various actions, there is no suggestion anywhere in Moreau that the mode of reporting to the RNC can or should be changed based on the mobile speed. The examiner repeatedly refers to Moreau as teaching "modifying the mode" based on the detected speed. There may be some "mode" in Moreau which can be considered to be changed based on detected speed, but it is not a mode of reporting measured parameters to the RNC, as is required in the claims of the present application.

The examiner points out that in the speed estimation mode of Moreau it measures the speed of the vehicle and adds the measured speed to the measurement report message from the mobile. But this is not changing the mode of reporting based on speed, it is simply reporting the speed. The examiner then refers to a "mode of reporting selection between a periodic transmission of the report messages...," but the examiner never identifies what two modes of reporting there might be. The fact of the matter is that there is only a single mode of reporting in Moreau. Lines 56-67 of column 10 of Moreau describe that both Vmin and Vmax have to be added to the parameters. Depending on how fast the mobile is moving, or whether it is moving at all, there may be different values reported in these two fields, but there is no change in the mode of reporting, just a change in the values of what is reported. When the mobile is moving, the report may indicate the max speed, and when the mobile is stationary the report may include the min speed, but in either case the mode of reporting is the same.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

U.S. Application No.: 10/780,403

Attorney Docket No.: Q102841

The examiner also mentions slow fading and fast fading, but it is not seen what

connection these have to a change in the mode of reporting.

Since none of the references teaches a change in the *mode* of reporting, and since this

feature is recited in all independent claims, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention

cannot result from any obvious modification of the applied prior art.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 5, 2008

/DJCushing/

David J. Cushing

Registration No. 28,703

4